

of that for which treatment would eventually be required. And so it is with the quack disease. We should be no less "strenuous" in our efforts to eradicate this disease, even though it be at our own financial loss. The Board of Examiners will very gladly co-operate with county societies, but the board will no longer undertake the work of prosecutions. It never was the duty of the board, and was done mainly that the law might be demonstrated and the proper method of prosecuting ascertained. It is now the duty of county societies to go on with the work, and the JOURNAL sincerely trusts that they will not shirk this duty. Alameda has already started its machinery; San Francisco is about to take similar action, and retain an attorney for the purpose of energetically getting after these gold-brick gentry. Which county will be the next in line?

Are we never to have an end of this sort of thing? Pay a dollar-a-month-and-have-no-further-doctor's-bills! Great thing. Effect a large saving in the family expense account. Receive the attention of the foremost (?) doctors and surgeons. Magnificent! But what does the subscriber really get? He gets just exactly what he pays for. He gets a "dollar-a-month doctor" to give him just as little care and attention as a "dollar-a-month doctor" will give. Incidentally, some physician who will not stoop to this sort of work loses a patient; is injured by the man to whom professional ethics and right living mean nothing at all but "words, words, words." All this is apropos of the fact that several new "contract-practice companies" have come into being in the course of the past few months, each, apparently, a little worse than its predecessor. Some of the promoters of these cheap institutions are resident in San Francisco, and we believe that there is a by-law of the medical society of that county prohibiting the use of physicians' names on the published "literature" of such institutions. Cannot this by-law be enforced?

At least two more state societies are on the road to that proper state of existence wherein they will own and publish their own journals. **STATE JOURNALS.** New Jersey and Ohio have the matter under consideration, and probably will eventually undertake the work. Missouri has decided to come into line, and has commenced the publication of its official journal. In Ohio there is some little complication owing to the desire of a privately owned journal to undertake to become the official organ of the State Association. The journal in question is one with which we have no quarrel, but the general principle involved is bad. A state association should absolutely own and control its own journal. Under no other circumstances can

there be absolute independence and freedom; and if there is any one thing which the publication of a state association should be, it is to be independent of all but professional strings.

Another contribution to the literature on digitalis appears in the present issue. The suggestion by our correspondent that often the **INERT DIGITALIS.** selection of inert plants may be the cause of the trouble is certainly within the range of probability. Right plants often cost more money than worthless ones; and dollars are dollars. But there are houses with whom this is a secondary consideration, and it cannot account for all the trouble. Probably the real fault in the majority of cases is in the manner of preparation. The active principles which should exist in preparations of digitalis, and to which the remedy owes its therapeutic value, are in the form of delicate, unstable glycerids, glucosids, etc., and are utterly destroyed by improper handling or too much heat. A skilled pharmacist, working with properly selected plants of the right sort, ought to have no difficulty in producing an absolutely reliable preparation of digitalis. If physicians would only go back to the safe, reliable, ethical and decent paths which their feet did formerly tread, and not be led into the by-ways of new and untried fads, "preparations," unknown mixtures with what-they-are-good-for on the label, and other such nonsensical nostrums, three classes would be benefited—the patient, the pharmacist and the physician himself.

The JOURNAL is very glad indeed to announce that a goodly number of the printed slips of the amount of alcohol contained in various nostrums have been called for. **ALCOHOL NOSTRUMS.** This table was printed in the June number, and there are still plenty of slips for those who may care to have them. All you need to do is to send us a request, and they will be forwarded by return mail. The work of making the people understand just what they are putting into their stomachs when they take these vile alcoholic mixtures should be the duty of every physician in the state. If an individual will insist upon drinking, let him at least drink something purer than this stuff; he could get decent whisky for less money.

#### A. M. A. FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

The report of the Board of Trustees, which is really the financial statement of the Association, published in the Journal for June 18th, pages 1635 to 1638, is a very interesting document, and well worthy careful study. The deductions made in the report from the figures presented are also worth considering. For instance, the auditor's statement shows:

Total revenue, of all sorts.....\$224,424.52  
 Total expenses, of all sorts..... 186,322.46

Net profit for year.....\$38,102.06

(How much of this \$38,102.06 was received for advertising "secret remedies," in violation of the principles of ethics of the American Medical Association, is not stated, and is merely an incidental query.)

The amount received for dues and interest is:

Dues ..... \$63,237.48  
 Interest and income from rents... 1,960.34

Income of the Association, not including Journal income. \$65,197.82

Against this revenue can be charged, as given on page 1637, the following:

Organization expense ..... \$5,323.19  
 Association expense ..... 6,629.80

Total Association expense.... \$11,952.99

As the report states that "This amount is an expense incurred by the Association, that has absolutely nothing to do with the expense of the Journal," we may assume that no other items of expense are chargeable to the Association per se, and not to the Journal.

Association income ..... \$65,197.82  
 Association expense ..... 11,952.99

Association, net income..... \$53,244.83

Against this net income from the Association as such, without reference to the Journal income, and from the figures of the report itself, consider the following:

Association, net income ..... \$53,244.83  
 Association and Journal net income 38,102.46

Cost of Journal to Association. \$15,142.77

In other words, the members of the American Medical Association are paying \$15,142.77 for the privilege of publishing the "greatest advertising medium for proprietary medicines in this country," while at the same time announcing to the world at large that they believe it "is equally derogatory to professional character for physicians to dispense or promote the use of secret remedies." Lovely; makes one swell up and feel proud and chesty. The trustees do not make this deduction from the report, but the figures are there.

#### VALUE OF BIG GAME.

The principal cities of California, strangely like the big cities everywhere else, are infested with quacks and illegal practitioners. The argument is so old that it is long past the stage of respect, that prosecutions should be confined to these small-fry quacks, and that prominent or able men, who, for various good and sufficient (?) reasons, may not have taken out a state license, should not be molested. Recently the issue has been raised by reason of the arrest and prosecution, by the Board of Medical Ex-

aminers, of a most estimable gentleman who was doing some clinical work in San Francisco, and, as was subsequently shown by his conviction, was really practicing medicine. Dr. A. Schmoll was to have read a paper before the San Francisco County Society, but when the status of the case was made known, the paper was withdrawn. Dr. Schmoll is unquestionably a very able man, and the issue was a purely technical one. But the law is the law, and to go after the small fry and leave undisturbed the man of attainments who is just as clearly in violation of the law, would be to make fish of one class and game of another; obviously unjust. An eastern medical journal has seen fit to comment adversely on this action by the Board of Examiners, and letters of criticism have been written to the JOURNAL on the same subject. In the present case the verdict was a purely technical one—guilty as charged—and no fine was imposed by the court; nor was any fine asked by the prosecution. Cannot the critics of such action see that to secure a conviction in a case like that under discussion is a most valuable precedent? The court records now show that discrimination is eliminated from the case when the medical practice law is in question; that the reputation or professional standing of a man is of no weight in the trial of the one fact—HAS THIS MAN A LICENSE TO PRACTICE MEDICINE OR HAS HE NOT? Small fry and big game are alike before the law, and we have shown that such is the case. The precedent cannot be undervalued, for as time goes by it will be again and again recalled that friends, professional standing, reputation, ability, scientific attainments nor anything else can be permitted to influence or modify the question at issue—HAS THIS MAN WHO IS PRACTICING MEDICINE IN CALIFORNIA SECURED A LICENSE TO DO SO? There can be no question of persecution, so often urged in the trial of illegal practitioners, when it is a matter of record that all are treated alike; that there is no class especially favored by the law. Therefore, with due regard and respect for our critics, we must congratulate the board on its action, and the court upon its decision; the law has been maintained.

[NOTE.—Since the foregoing editorial was written and put into type, a singular and most untoward thing has occurred. A great deal of pressure and "influence" was brought to bear, the case against Dr. Schmoll was reopened, and he was discharged on the ground that his professional services had been given gratuitously. The actual question at issue—whether the doctor was practicing without a license—was ignored. For medical men to aid in even technically setting aside the wise provisions of the law is a serious mistake, and soon or late those who are largely responsible for such a result, in the present case, will see the harm they have done, and will regret it.]